

1 PRISON LAW OFFICE
2 DONALD SPECTER, #83925
3 SARA NORMAN, #189536
4 General Delivery
San Quentin, CA 94964
Telephone: (415) 457-9144

5 DISABILITY RIGHTS EDUCATION
6 AND DEFENSE FUND, INC.
ARLENE MAYERSON, #79310
7 2212 6th Street
Berkeley, CA 94710
Telephone: (510) 644-2555

8 LAW OFFICES OF ELAINE B.
9 FEINGOLD
ELAINE B. FEINGOLD, #99226
10 1524 Scenic Ave.
Berkeley, CA 94708
11 Telephone: (510) 848-8125

12 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

McCUTCHEON DOYLE BROWN &
ENERSEN
WARREN E. GEORGE, #53588
Three Embarcadero Center
San Francisco, CA 94111-4066
Telephone: (415) 393-2000

ROSEN BIEN & ASARO
MICHAEL W. BIEN, #96891
155 Montgomery St., 8th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94104
Telephone: (415) 433-6830

RECEIVED

JAN 25 2002

RICHARD W. WIEKING
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
OAKLAND

FILED

FEB - 8 2002

RICHARD W. WIEKING
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
OAKLAND

785
ap

14 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
15 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

17 JOHN ARMSTRONG, et al.,
18 Plaintiffs,
19 v.
20 GRAY DAVIS, et al.,
21 Defendants.

No. C-94-2307-CW

[PLAINTIFFS' PROPOSED]
ORDER REQUIRING DEFENDANTS
TO MAKE PRISON FACILITIES
STRUCTURALLY ACCESSIBLE

24 Good cause being found, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that within 120 days of the
25 date of this Order, defendants shall remove each barrier to access identified by Peter
26 Robertson at the fifteen prisons and Reception Centers designated to house prisoners
27 whose disabilities impact their placement, unless defendants submit to the Court a written
28 report within 90 days of the date of this Order explaining why (a) a barrier does not

CR

1 prevent access to programs, services, or activities for class members or (b) the identified
2 barrier does in fact comply with applicable accessibility guidelines (with appropriate
3 citations to the relevant federal accessibility guidelines). If instead of removing a barrier
4 defendants choose to supply an explanation as to why the identified barrier does comply
5 with applicable accessibility guidelines, that explanation must be in the form of sworn
6 testimony by a person with expertise in accessibility standards who is competent to make
7 such a determination.

8 This Order is narrowly drawn, extends no further than necessary to correct the
9 violation of the rights at issue and is the least intrusive means necessary to correct the
10 violation of the rights.
11

12 IT IS SO ORDERED.
13

14 Dated: FEB - 8 2002
15

16 
17 CLAUDIA WILKEN
18 U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28